

Page 1

**VIA ECF/EMAIL**

Honorable District Judge Gregory Woods  
United States District Court  
Southern District of New York  
40 Foley Square  
New York, NY 10007

Re: *Kumaran vs. Vision Financial Markets* - 1:20-Cv-03871-GHW-SDA

**LETTER MOTION FOR LIMITED EXCESS PAGES (4.5 PAGES)**

Dear Hon Judge Gregory Woods;

Plaintiffs *Pro-Se* and by and through the undersigned counsel, Mr. August, that represent the corporate Nefertiti entities Nefertiti Risk Capital Management, LLC, (“NRCM”) Nefertiti Asset Management (“NAM”) and Nefertiti Holding Corporation (“NHC”) as Plaintiffs in this action. Pursuant to Local Rule 3.A I respectfully move to request the following limited number of excess pages to the Appeal pursuant to FRCP 72(a) brief to the two pending motions, both of which are potentially dispositive or material in decision to Plaintiffs.

For Plaintiffs Appeal Brief to the Order ECF129 -> 4.5 pages

Good cause for this is because

1. The motions to dismiss are dispositive and could prejudice my clients or Plaintiff Pro-Se if the motion does not include relevant facts and law, or apply the proper legal precedent or rules.
2. The areas of law covered in this motion required a more in depth briefing, especially on the application of the G&F Agreements, which have detailed provision that implicate various Vision Affiliates and Defendants that have claimed they are not subject to interpretation of the ADMIS contracts.
3. Any ruling that does not properly integrate the prior rulings in related case 20-CV-3873 may cause unnecessary motion practices on areas of law or rulings that are inconsistent. To avoid future inconsistencies
4. This motion covers two Defendants (Vision Defendants and Villa Defendants) who will likely file two separate briefs.
5. This case involves complex regulatory law under the Commodities Exchange Act, as well as duties imparted to agents and fiduciary who may not be registered but assume the role of AP’S (without license) and also involves areas of law related to duties under Securities laws 10(b).

Plaintiffs do not object in advance to a similar number of excess pages to Defendants in Opposition.

Finally, in accordance with Individual Rules of Practice for Pro-Se Plaintiffs, there are no page limits for Pro-Se Plaintiffs. However Plaintiffs have combined their briefs for simplicity of the Court and 30 pages has been allocated previously for a combined brief.

In the alternative, I respectfully request no prejudice to my clients and request one more week to edit the briefs. Since the motion is fully completed and no additional legal argument is needed, we respectfully seek the Court approval that these few pages should not inconvenience the Court or Defendants.

Page 2

This motion and Appeal was timely filed within fourteen (14) days.

Respectfully submitted,

//BMA//

Brian M. August, Esq

Counsel for NRCM, NAM and NHC

/SSK//

Samantha S. Kumaran

Individual Pro-Se Plaintiff